

### REMARKS

There remains pending in this application claims 1-16, of which claims 1, 6, and 11 are independent. No claims have been added or cancelled.

Applicant has amended Figure 3 to eliminate duplicate use of reference character "303" and have made a corresponding amendment to page 11 of the specification. Accordingly, there is accompanying this Amendment a replacement sheet of Figure 3 reflecting that change. Acceptance of the replacement sheet and withdrawal of the drawing objection is respectfully sought.

Applicant also submits herewith a new and more descriptive title. Favorable consideration and withdrawal of the objection to the title are also respectfully sought.

Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. (The Official Action refers to claims 10-15, but only claims 11-15 are directed to a program and therefore it is understood that the rejection was intended to apply only to claims 11-15.) In view of the above amendments, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 11 has been further amended to recite that the program is limited to one which can be executed by an information processing apparatus serving as a host computer. As such, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant has not merely claimed a set of instructions per se, but has claimed a limited sequence of computer instructions being executed by an information processing apparatus serving as a host computer. It is respectfully submitted that such claim is sufficiently connected to and interwoven with the physical apparatus serving as a host computer and is not merely functional language. As such, it is respectfully submitted that

independent claim 11, as well as claims 12-15 which depend therefrom, are statutory subject matter.

Each of independent claims 1 and 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gunning et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,548). In view of the above amendments, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The invention as set forth in independent claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus serving as a host computer for processing a printing request from an application and generating print data which can be printed by a printer. The apparatus comprises a display control means for controlling a display unit to display an output setting view screen in which a value of an output setting item is set, a paper size setting means for setting an input paper size of a document inputted from the application and an output paper size of print data printed by the printer via the output setting view screen displayed by the display control means and generating means for generating the print data on the basis of the input paper size and the output paper size set by the paper size setting means. The invention is characterized in that when the input paper size is set, the display control means controls the display unit to display a paper size which is supported as the output paper size by the printer and a paper size which is not supported as the paper size by the printer so that they can be discriminated from each other, and when the output paper size is set, the display control means controls the display unit to display a paper size which is supported by the printer. The invention is further characterized in that a number of the input paper sizes is larger than the number of output paper sizes.

Independent claims 6 and 11 are directed to an information processing method and an information processing program for controlling a host computer, and have each been

amended in the same manner as claim 1. Accordingly, the salient features of the invention as recited in claims 6 and 11 correspond to claim 1.

In accordance with the invention as now recited in each of the above independent claims, the information processing apparatus allows the user to set both the input paper size and the output paper size. Moreover, the input paper size includes not only paper sizes supported as the output paper size by the printer, but also paper sizes not supported as the output paper size by the printer, and the different types of input paper sizes are displayed so as to be distinguishable from each other. Thus, and with reference to Figure 7 of the present application, the four input paper sizes indicated as “MK” are not supported as the output paper sizes by the printer and are displayed so as to be distinguishable from the other three input paper sizes which are.

Moreover, and also as now recited in each of the independent claims, the output paper size is a paper size supported by the printer and therefore, the number of input paper sizes is larger than the number of the output paper sizes.

Gunning et al. is directed to a method for dynamically synchronizing configuration information between a printer and an attached accessory. It features a scanner 15 having a copy processor 16 and display U128. The processor 16 receives printer configuration parameters from a controller 24 and displays them on a display U128. However, there is no teaching or suggestion of setting two different types of paper sizes, namely, the input paper size and the output paper size. Moreover, Gunning et al. also fails to teach or suggest displaying an input paper size supported as the output paper size by the printer and an input paper size not supported as the output paper size by the printer so that they are distinguishable from each other.

Applicant has also reviewed the secondary references to Webb et al. and Morikawa.

Webb et al. features a printer 16 having an operation panel 35 and a first apparatus 11 with display 31. The host apparatus 11 performs bi-directional communication with the printer 16 and displays the contents of the operation, 35 in the display 31. Morikawa shows an image forming apparatus in which an operation unit, provided in the image forming apparatus, displays operation items of the image forming apparatus such that they are divided into two areas, an upper area and a bottom area.

Neither of the secondary references are understood to meet the shortcomings of Gunning et al. More specifically, neither of the references teach or suggest setting two different types of paper sizes. They also fail to teach or suggest displaying an input paper size supported as the output paper size by the printer and an input paper size not supported as the output paper size by the printer being distinguishable from each other.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that each of independent claims 1, 6, and 11 are distinguishable over the applied art of record. The remaining claims in the above application are dependent claims which depend either directly or indirectly from one of the above discussed independent claims and are therefore patentable over the art of record for reasons noted above with respect to the independent claims. In addition, each recite features of the invention still further distinguishing it from the applied art. Favorable and independent consideration thereof is respectfully sought.

Applicant respectfully submits that all outstanding matters in the above application have been addressed and that this application is in condition for allowance.

Favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the above application are respectfully sought.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Lawrence A. Stahl  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 30,110

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

LAS:eyw

DC\_MAIN 209667v1